

Floodplain Task Force Strategies and Tools Survey Summary

For purposes of this summary:

- Strong Agreement:* The number of respondents selecting "1", "2", or "3" totalled 9 or more.
- Moderate Agreement:* The number of respondents selecting "1", "2", or "3" totalled 7 or 8.
- No Agreement:* The number of respondents selecting "1", "2" or "3" was less than 7 and selecting "4" or "5" was less than 7.
- Disagreement:* The number of respondents selecting "4" or "5" was 7 or more.

Questions with which there was strong agreement:

3. If one of the standards identified in Question 1 were adopted, there should be language to allow flexibility regarding stream crossing structures and other public infrastructure. (See page 2-12 of CDM Report.)
4. Specific flood storage areas identified in the City of Lincoln Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for Salt Creek should be reflected in the ordinance. (See Appendix A from 12/3/02 handout.)
6. The 'Minimum Flood Corridor' or other stream buffer standard should be applied within the FEMA-mapped floodplains. (See: 1) Page 4-12 of CDM Report, 2) Appendix B from 12/3/02 handout, and 3) Task

Force notebook "Overview of Existing Regulations" section).

8. The 'Minimum Flood Corridor' or other stream buffer standard should also be applied along smaller streams that do not drain 150 acres.
9. A standard buffer (such as 110-' each side of stream) should be established.
11. Some impacts to the buffer area should be allowed, but only if mitigated.
13. Special best management practices should be required in floodplain areas.
14. If adopted, best management practices should include swales, water quality wetlands, retention cells, infiltration basins and other similar elements.
16. A mitigation system should be established for riparian buffers and/or wetland areas within floodplains?
17. The required level for building protection in a 100-year flood plain should be greater than 1 foot.
18. The City's substantial improvement threshold should be applied on a cumulative basis
19. The City should continue its current policy for maintaining storage on surplus/vacated property.
21. The City should have a proactive floodplain buyout program with dedicated funds (or local match funds dedicated for grant programs).
22. If Property Buyouts are considered, there should be criteria for minimizing impacts to neighborhoods and historic districts.

23. Strategies should be used to promote buyouts that make sense relative to flood storage/conveyance/contiguous green spaces.
24. Eminent domain should be considered with regard to Question 20.
25. Criteria for “grandfather” exceptions should be established.
26. No Adverse Impact is a concept that makes sense to adopt for the City of Lincoln.
28. There should be additional incentives for cluster development in the floodplain.
29. The City should charge a floodplain development fee.
30. The tie between watershed master plans for the City of Lincoln (and its future growth areas) and the zoning and subdivision ordinances should be strengthened to clearly require regulation of the 100-year floodplain as identified in completed master plans (for both development sites and individual buildings) until FEMA maps are amended to reflect the revised floodplain boundary.
31. The tie between watershed master plans for the City of Lincoln (and its future growth areas) and the zoning and subdivision ordinances should be strengthened to clearly require development of information regarding stormwater runoff to be submitted on a sub-basin level that is compatible with the City/NRD watershed models.
32. The tie between watershed master plans for the City of Lincoln (and its future growth areas) and the zoning and subdivision ordinances should be strengthened to clearly require impacts of individual developments be compatible with the master plan goals regarding water quantity.

33. The tie between watershed master plans for the City of Lincoln (and its future growth areas) and the zoning and subdivision ordinances should be strengthened to clearly require regulation of the future conditions 100-year floodplain as identified in each watershed master plan.
35. The new standards should include any additional 100-year flood limits shown along tributaries as a requirement of preliminary plats.

Questions with which there was moderate agreement:

5. A floodplain mitigation concept should be established for flood storage (See Floodplain Mitigation fact sheet, page 4-16 of *Fact Sheets* booklet.)

A No Net Rise and Compensatory Storage standard should be adopted. (See No Net Rise and Compensatory Storage fact sheet, page 4-6 of *Fact Sheets* booklet.)

In regard to A No Net Rise and Compensatory Storage standard should be adopted. (See No Net Rise and Compensatory Storage fact sheet, page 4-6 of *Fact Sheets* booklet.) there was moderate agreement that it apply to all development except for existing development within the City Limits.

In regard to the Greenfield approach there was moderate agreement that it apply to all development except for existing development within the City limits (six people ranked development and new growth as "1" or "2").

In regard to cumulative substantial improvements, there was moderate agreement that the City's substantial improvement threshold should be applied.

Questions with which there was no agreement:

10. The Minimum Flood Corridor standard should be modified not to permit stormwater detention cells in the riparian corridor.
34. The new standards should apply only to the FEMA-mapped and/or master-planned floodplains.

In regard to Best Management Practices, there was no agreement about how it should be applied.

In regard to cluster/open space development there was no agreement on how it should be applied.

There was no agreement on what the City's substantial improvement threshold should be.

Questions with which there was disagreement:

7. The 'Minimum Flood Corridor' or other stream buffer standard should be applied within the FEMA-mapped floodplain only where there is no mapped floodway.